Customer No.: 31561 Docket No.: 12447-US-PA

Application No.: 10/708,489

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action

mailed January 03, 2007. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and

presently pending claims 1-6 are respectfully requested.

Discussion of Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejected claims 1 and 5-6 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Houghton et al US 6,429,730.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of Claims 1 and 5-6 under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) because Houghton does not teach every recitation of these claims. For

example, Houghton does not disclose a voltage regulator apparatus having "a first

transistor having ...a third terminal directly coupled to the output terminal of the

voltage regulator, and a second transistor having ... a third terminal coupled to a

negative terminal of the voltage source" as recited in Claim 1.

In order to properly anticipate Applicant's claimed invention under 102, each

and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently

described, in a single prior art reference." Further, "[t]he identical invention must be

shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." See MPEP §2131, quoting

Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed.

Page 6 of 11

PAGE 8/13 \* RCVD AT 4/2/2007 5:01:43 AM [Eastern Daylight Time] \* SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-3/8 \* DNIS:2738300 \* CSID: \* DURATION (mm-ss):09-10

APR-02-2007 MON 17:04 FAX NO.

Customer No.: 31561 Docket No.: 12447-US-PA P. 09

Application No.: 10/708,489

Cir. 1989). Finally, "[t]he elements must be arranged as required by the claim." See

MPEP § 2131.

In rejecting Claim 1, the examiner asserts "the bias circuit 24 reads on the

voltage regulator apparatus, the reference generation stage 30 reads on the voltage

regulator and the transistors 60 and 54 read on the first and second transistors.

Houghton's FIG. 4 schematically shows a structure of the bias circuit 24. The

bias circuit 24 includes a reference generation stage 30 and a current drive stage 32.

Transistors 34, 36, 38 and 40 comprise a voltage divider circuit, so that the voltages at

nodes 48 and 50 are reference voltages (i.e. nodes 48 and 50 are output terminals of the

stage 30). Vout 64 is roughly divided across transistors 60 and 54 and in between the

voltages at nodes 48 and 50 (for example, Vout is 1.6V). Transistors 58 and 56 form a

4:1 current mirror.

Although the circuit disclosed by Houghton uses the reference generation stage

30 and the current drive stage 32 to generate a fixed and stable reference voltage Vout

64, the elements and the arrangements thereof are not same as those recited in Claim 1

of the application.

First, the third terminal (source terminal) of the transistor 60 is directly coupled

to the output terminal Vout 64 of the bias circuit, not directly coupled to the output

terminal (nodes 48 or 50) of the reference generation stage 30 because the output

Page 7 of 11

PAGE 9/13 \* RCVD AT 4/2/2007 5:01:43 AM [Eastern Daylight Time] \* SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-3/8 \* DNIS:2738300 \* CSID: \* DURATION (mm-ss):09-10

APR-02-2007 MON 17:04 FAX NO.

Customer No.: 31561 Docket No.: 12447-US-PA P. 10

Application No.: 10/708,489

terminal Vout 64 of the bias circuit 24 is not the output terminal (nodes 48 or 50) of the

reference generation stage 30.

Secondly, the third terminal (drain terminal) of the transistor 54 is coupled to the

gate terminal of the transistor 58 and the drain terminal of the transistor 56, not coupled

to a negative terminal of the voltage source.

Thirdly, in rejection of claim 1 based on Houghton's FIG. 4, the transistors 58

and 56 in stage 32 are omitted by the Examiner. The transistors 58 and 56 are

necessary because they form a 4:1 current mirror for determining the I-V characteristic

of the output. The reference must be considered as a whole. And also, the transistors

58 and 56 cannot be considered as a part of the stage 30 because Houghton does not

teach so. However, in Claim 1 of the application, no current mirror is recited.

Accordingly, Houghton does not disclose a voltage regulator apparatus having

"a first transistor having ... a third terminal directly coupled to the output terminal of

the voltage regulator; and a second transistor having ... a third terminal coupled to a

negative terminal of the voltage source" as recited in Claim 1.

Because Houghton does not teach each and every recitation of claim 1,

Applicants request that the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be withdrawn

and the claim allowed.

Page 8 of 11

PAGE 10/13 \* RCVD AT 4/2/2007 5:01:43 AM [Eastern Daylight Time] \* SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-3/8 \* DNIS:2738300 \* CSID: \* DURATION (mm-ss):09-10

APR-02-2007 MON 17:10 FAX NO. P. 11

> Customer No.: 31561 Docket No.: 12447-US-PA

Application No.: 10/708,489

Claims 5-6 depend from claim 1. As explained, claim 1 is distinguishable from

the cited art. Accordingly, claims 5-6 are also distinguishable from this reference for at least the same reasons set forth in connection with base claim 1. Further, this reference

fails to teach or suggest the recitations of claims 5-6.

Accordingly, because Houghton fails to teach all of the recitations of claims 5-6,

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of these claims

under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and allow the claims.

Discussion of New Claims

Applicants respectfully submit that New Claims 9-15 are allowable because

New Claims 9-15 are distinguishable over the cited reference. Further, Houghton fails

to teach a voltage regulator apparatus having "a voltage regulator ... comprising an

error amplifier for receiving the reference voltage; a first transistor having ... a third

terminal directly coupled to the output terminal of the voltage regulator; and a second

transistor having ... a third terminal coupled to a negative terminal of the voltage

source" as recited in Claim 9.

Because Houghton does not teach each and every recitation of claim 9,

Applicants request that Claim 9 should be allowed.

Claims 10-15 depend from claim 9. As explained, claim 9 is distinguishable from the

Page 9 of 11

PAGE 11/13 \* RCVD AT 4/2/2007 5:01:43 AM [Eastern Daylight Time] \* SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-3/8 \* DNIS:2738300 \* CSID: \* DURATION (mm-ss):09-10

Customer No.: 31561 Docket No.: 12447-US-PA Application No.: 10/708,489

cited art. Accordingly, claims 10-15 are also distinguishable from this reference for at least the same reasons set forth in connection with base claim 9. Further, this reference fails to teach or suggest the recitations of claims 10-15.

Customer No.: 31561 Docket No.: 12447-US-PA Application No.: 10/708,489

## CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 1-6 are in proper condition for allowance and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date:

April 2, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office

7th Floor-1, No. 100

Roosevelt Road, Section 2

Taipei, 100

Taiwan

Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800

Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233

Email: belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw

Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw